C.S.100/ SINGLE BENCH 1 3

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition NO. 1155 /2006

Service matter

PETITIONER : Smt. Nirmala Banjare @
Ku. Nirmala Shande
Aged about 34 years
W/o. Shri Nakul Banjare
Working as Cook
Post Matric Kanya Chhatrawas,
Masturi, District Bilaspur (C.G.)

P.R. No. 1112/26
Presented by Rajkishor Pandey
Dated 28/12/06

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS : 1. State of Chhattisgarh
Through Secretary
Schedule Tribe, Schedule Caste,
OBC & Minority Welfare &
Development Mantralaya D.K.S.
Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)

2. Commissioner
Tribal Welfare & Development
Raipur (C.G.)

3. The Collector
(Tribal Welfare Development)
District Bilaspur (C.G.)

4. Assistant Commissioner
(Tribal Welfare Development)
District Bilaspur (C.G.)

RE[illegible]VED-COPY
28.12.06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS, CERTIORARI AND FOR OTHER SUITABLE WRIT OR WRITS ORDER OR ORDERS DIRECTION OR DIRECTIONS.

1. **PARTICULARS OF THE PETITIONER**

As per the cause title above.

2. **PARTICULARS OF THE RESPONDENTS**

As per the cause title above.

3. **PARTICULARS OF THE ORDER (S) IMPUGNED AGAINST WHICH PETITION IS MADE.**

The petitioner, by way of this writ petition is not challenging any particular order of the respondents but is seeking a writ of mandamus commanding the respondents to extend the benefit of pay scale and

(29)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR
Writ Petition No. 1150 of 2006

Petitioner : Smt. Nirmala Banjare

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh & others

Single Bench: Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri**.

Shri Goutam Khetrapal, counsel for the petitioner.
Shri Sushil Dubey, Government Advocate for the respondents/State.

ORAL ORDER

(25th March, 2006)

1. In this petition, the petitioner seeks a writ in the nature of mandamus commanding the respondents to implement the benefit of the revised 5th pay scale w.e.f. 1.1.1996 with interest.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has already made representation through union to respondent No. 2. Learned counsel confines his prayer to consideration of the petitioner's representation already made through union to respondent No. 2.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents have no objection.

4. Accordingly, respondent No. 2 is directed to consider the representation of the petitioner, if any, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order in accordance with law.

5. For the reasons stated above, the petition stands disposed of. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Bablu